

Section 2: Determining The Key Program Elements: Guidelines For Quality

Susan Muenchow
American Institutes for Research



Over the last five years in California, several groups have been involved in statewide preschool planning efforts and/or grant-making initiatives. These include Superintendent Delaine Eastin's Universal Preschool Task Force, the Master Plan for Education School Readiness Work Group, the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, Children Now, Preschool California, and the First 5 California Children and Families Commission. Among these groups, there are several areas of agreement or core principles:

- That the principal focus is in preparing children for school, motivated by research showing both the short-term educational benefits and the long-term savings that can be generated by investments in quality preschool;
- That at least a part day of preschool should be available and free to all, regardless of income;
- That participation in preschool programs should be voluntary;
- That in order to ensure that programs of school readiness quality are available to children of working parents, preschool programs should be linked to or embedded in full-day programs for those families that need them;
- That the programs should be available in a range of settings, including school-based sites, centers and family child care homes, so long as they meet rigorous preschool standards;
- That programs should respect and reflect California's cultural and linguistic diversity; and
- That development of a well-trained and well-compensated workforce must be a key focus in the effort to provide access to Preschool for All.

Once having agreed that quality preschool programs should be accessible to all children, however, what are the key elements of quality that will help achieve the full benefits or promise of preschool?

This section begins with an overview summarizing some highlights of recent research on preschool program elements and the implications for program planning. Table 2-1 displays research findings by program element, such as teacher qualifications, teacher compensation, length of day/year, curriculum, inclusion of children with special needs, culturally and linguistically appropriate programs. The section then provides two tables (II-2, and II-3) summarizing the characteristics and program elements of the major existing publicly funded early care and education programs in California. Finally, Table 2-4 crosswalks guidelines from the Superintendent's Universal Preschool Task Force, the Master Plan for School Readiness Work Group, and the First 5 California Preschool for All. This table is intended to serve as a planning worksheet for First 5 commissions, school districts, and other interested planning a Preschool-for-All program, and includes space for local planners to fill in their policy goal in relation to each program element.

Some Highlights of Recent Research on Preschool

It's the quality of the teachers that matters most.

There is a recurring theme in recent research on preschool and early care and education generally that the most important element is the qualifications and compensation of the teachers. In a recently released study of Georgia's Pre-K program, where 80 % of teachers have a Bachelor's or advanced degree, teacher qualifications were not only related to improved child outcomes on emerging literacy and pre-math skills, but also to more sensitive interactions between teachers and children (Henry, 2003).

Despite the consensus that quality of preschool programs depends in large part on teacher qualifications, however, only 25 of the 40 states that offer state-financed Pre-K require teachers in these programs to have a Bachelor's degree in early childhood education or another subject. Meanwhile all 50 states require that kindergarten teachers have Bachelor's degrees (Ackerman, 2003).

California established a Child Development Permit Matrix that provides a career lattice for early care and education staff, but it is among the 15 states with Pre-kindergarten programs that do not require preschool teachers to have a Bachelor's degree or even an Associate's degree. The major barrier to the recruitment and retention of preschool teachers with BAs is not the lack of regulatory requirements, however, but rather the low compensation. Preschool teachers earn less than half of the salary of kindergarten teachers, and the gap between their salaries and those of other staff with similar qualifications actually widens as their level of education increases (Barnett, 2003).

Low staff-child ratios are important, but must be determined in relation to teacher qualifications and class size.

A review of state preschool programs serving four-year-olds suggests that the typical adult-to-child ratio is 1:9 to 1:10 in those states where at least one teacher in the classroom is required to have a Bachelor's degree, with a maximum class size of 18-20. More protective ratios may be required for programs serving three-year-olds or those with special needs.

California's preschool program is atypical of state preschool programs in that it allows a larger class size (24) but requires a more protective adult-child ratio (1:8). At the same time, while California's teacher qualifications include 24 units in child development or early childhood education, the state is also among the 17 states with pre-kindergarten programs that do not require every classroom to have a teacher with a Bachelor's degree (Ackerman, 2003).

As California localities experiment with preschool demonstration projects, and attempt to improve the qualifications and compensation of preschool teachers, it may be important to consider moving toward the slightly less protective staff-child ratio requirement of 1:10 for those classrooms meeting the more stringent teacher qualifications. Even now, some state preschool programs are

only able to meet the 1:8 ratio by recruiting parents or other volunteers to be the third adult in the classroom, and this practice could be encouraged to augment the 1:10 ratio.

Although reducing the class size from 24 to 20 would ultimately increase expenditure for facilities, it is more consistent with the recommended guidelines of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, California's Master Plan for Education School Readiness Workgroup recommendations, and California's policy on class size for children in elementary school.

Curriculum counts.

Although no single curriculum for preschool has been identified as best, there is agreement that it is important to have one – in the sense of a set of learning guidelines to ensure that all domains of children's learning and development are addressed, and that there is a balance of teacher- and child-initiated activities (Schumacher, Irish & Lombardi, 2003; Bowman et al., 2001).

There is also concern that early childhood programs serving educationally disadvantaged children have sometimes paid insufficient attention to the development of emerging literacy skills, such as print awareness and letter-sound correspondence, which have been found to be related to the ease with which children learn to read later on (Zill et al., 2001; Snow, Burns & Griffin, 1998).

Similarly, there has been too little emphasis on emerging numeracy -- not just teaching children about counting, which is sometimes done to excess, but more importantly, beginning to acquaint children with the concepts of sorting, comparing (e.g., *taller than*, *smaller than*), sequencing (e.g., *before* and *after*) and measurement – the building blocks for analytical thinking.

The California Department of Education/Child Development Division's *Prekindergarten Learning and Development Guidelines* offer a balanced, developmentally appropriate approach to structuring a program that will enhance children's language, cognitive, social-emotional, and physical development. The *Guidelines* also stress that social and emotional development is the foundation of all learning. CDD has contracted with Sonoma State University to develop a Prekindergarten Learning and Development Curricular Guide to be published in late 2004. A training project will be implemented once the Curricular Guide is in print. There will also be website at Sonoma State University, California Institute for Human Services with more information as the training project takes shape.

In summary, for preschool children, the goal is not "drill and kill," but to engage children in the kind of developmentally appropriate activities that will spark their curiosity, creativity, and focus as learners.

From the standpoint of preparing children for school, access to full-year programming is important.

According to a recently released study of the Georgia Pre-K program, during the summer months, when children are less likely to be in preschool programs, some of the gains they accomplish during the school year are reduced or even reversed, and these losses appear to be more serious for children from high-risk families who are more likely to enter kindergarten behind their peers from the beginning (Henry, 2003). Mothers with higher levels of education appear to counteract

summer learning loss in receptive language, however not for word and letter recognition or problem solving skills. As a result, the study concludes that “children need programs that enhance and reinforce their development over the summer or the children lose a portion of the knowledge and skills learned during the school year” (Henry, 2003).

For California, these findings suggest that local planners may want to consider seriously the First 5 California Preschool Demonstration Grant option of operating programs for a full year (245 days). These findings also cast a new light on the summer pre-kindergarten transition programs in which many local First 5 commissions are investing -- as a valuable supplement, though not a substitute, for preschool and other early care and education programs that take place during the school year.

A substantial portion of preschool services must be available in -- or linked to -- full-day, full-year settings, or children of working parents will be unable to participate.

Between 1970 and 2001, the percentage of mothers with children birth to age five who were employed grew from 28 to 59 percent (Schumacher, Irish, & Lombardi, 2003). For many of these families, placing their very young children in a part-day, part-year preschool program is logistically difficult if not impossible.

To make quality preschool accessible to children of working parents, one approach is to embed preschool services in existing early care and education programs that operate full-day, full-year. See Section 4 for how to estimate the proportion of children in a community who will need full-day vs. part-day services, and a cost estimate for adding a preschool component to an existing full-day, full-year program. Another option is to link part-day programs to other early care and education services that provide transportation or are within easy reach of the part-day programs.

Family child care homes have an important role to play in preparing children for school, and in linking services for infants and toddlers to those for preschool children.

Family child care homes provide a substantial proportion of the early care and education in California. Family child care, as compared to center or school-based care, adapts more easily to family work schedules; serves infants and toddlers and school-age children as well as preschool children; and offers an environment more similar to that of a child’s home. In rural areas, family child care may be the predominant source of out-of-home child care. Recognizing the role these providers play in preparing children for school, the California Department of Education/Child Development Division is engaged in a project to adapt its *Pre-kindergarten Learning and Development Guidelines* to family child care and exempt care settings.

Most proponents of universal preschool recommend two roles for family child care in a Preschool for All system. First, family child care providers who meet the new Preschool teacher educational requirements may qualify to provide publicly funded preschool in a full-day, full-year setting. Second, family child care providers are in a strong position to reinforce the learning that takes place in a school- and center-based programs with early care and education activities in a more natural, intimate setting. In the context of the 10 to 12 hours young children may spend away

from their own homes while their parents work, the small group setting of a family child care home may provide the ideal balance to a part-day, structured program in a school or center.

Once having agreed that family child care has an important role to play in a preschool system, however, there are still logistical issues to be resolved. Can small family child care homes, which serve six or fewer children, and frequently in mixed age groups, provide enough hours of activity specifically geared toward preschool-age children to achieve the desired results? Should direct provision of publicly funded preschool be limited to large family child care homes more apt to have a substantial group of preschool-age children that will offer a peer group experience more similar to that of center- or school-based program? Given issues such as economy of scale and staff-child ratios, will it be possible to provide a rate that makes participation by family child care providers financially feasible? What provisions should be made to ensure accountability to standards when family child care homes are independently operated and geographically widely dispersed?

As the Preschool for All demonstration project proceeds, it will be important to explore various approaches for involving family child care. For example, Los Angeles First 5 is considering a family child care network model where a supervising teacher with a Bachelor's degree would visit several family child care homes each week, and the children might spend a portion of one day in a larger group in a school-like setting. First 5 California Preschool for All Demonstration Grant criteria also envision that participating family child care homes will be part of family child care networks.

Preschool programs must be culturally and linguistically appropriate.

Research suggests that young children are biologically primed for language development, and that they can learn multiple languages, while it is helpful to be grounded in one. When children who

"As a child who was a second language learner from first generation immigrants, being culturally competent in English, and in the home language, has been essential and invaluable. This is because one cannot help but feel a deep sense of loss when one's home language cannot be passed on to our own children. It is something that is so essential to one's identity and self-esteem."

"We want to create learning environments that are additive, not subtractive."

- Comments by Head Start Bureau Focus Group Participants

are just learning to speak in one language also begin to learn a second language, it may take them a bit longer to master the grammar and proper syntax in either. But being exposed to multiple languages by the time a child is in preschool and on a continuing basis has lasting benefits. Becoming bilingual is not

just acquiring another language but also being able to think and view the world in multiple ways. Knowledge of two or more languages is a valuable skill that should be encouraged and strengthened.

Respecting a child's home language means respecting an important part of the child's identity – the child's culture, background, and way of expressing himself or herself. Thus, at the same time that young children are primed to learn a second language, it is also important to help them preserve their first language and the culture in which it is rooted. For early educators, it is a responsibility to promote partnerships with families, and respecting the language of the child's family is part of building a partnership with them. English language learners need the support of programs that reinforce their two languages, rather than immersing them in the second language at

the cost of denying their first language. The need to have staff who can communicate with the children and their families in their home language, as well as in English, has many ramifications for professional development efforts in the community. For more specific recommendations developed for the Head Start Bureau regarding English Language Learners, see the Section 2 Appendix.

Preschool programs play a crucial role in helping children with special needs.

Elk Grove's Inclusive Preschool Services

Elk Grove's preschool programs are committed to providing quality services for all families and encouraging enrollment of children with disabilities. It is the belief of Elk Grove's preschool programs that children are much more alike than different during the first five years of life. They are also much more accepting of differences. Including children with disabilities in the preschool classroom provides children and families an opportunity to learn from each other.

- Excerpted from Elk Grove Unified School District Preschool Parent Handbook

Research suggests that early identification of special needs, and intervention to address them, has many benefits. Children with disabilities who receive early-intervention services show “significant” developmental improvements even after only one year of service, according to a

report to Congress by the federal Department of Education (2003). Moreover, there is evidence that the earlier the identification of special needs and the onset of intervention, the better. Just a year after receiving such services, many infants and toddlers reached milestones in motor skills, self-help, communication and cognition. The children's parents also reported feeling better able to help their children learn and cope. Hence, ideally, disabilities and special needs will be detected and services begun long before a child with special needs reaches preschool age. However, preschool offers one more important opportunity to do so before a child enters school.

Inclusive preschool programs can benefit children with and without disabilities. Key elements of inclusive preschool programs include a positive program philosophy, collaboration between early childhood educators and early childhood special educators, high quality curriculum, specialized instruction, and a critical mass of typically developing peers (Odom, 2003; Wolery & Wilbers, 1994).

At its best, Preschool for All can provide leverage to upgrade the entire system of early care and education.

By providing incentives to upgrade their teacher requirements and other program standards in order to participate in the preschool program, Preschool for All can potentially improve services not only for four-year-olds, but also help raise the standard of service for younger children in early care and education.

Georgia's Pre-K program provides an incentive for a broad range of early care and education programs -- including school-based programs, Head Start, and non-profit and for-profit child care centers -- to upgrade their services by offering preschool grants, through a competitive process. 57 percent of the providers are for-profit and non-profit early care and education providers, Head Start, universities and religious organizations (Schumacher, Irish, & Lombardi, 2003). In addition, the state has provided enhancement grants to programs that serve infants and toddlers as well as preschool children. Preliminary results from a survey conducted by Lombardi and Young

to be released in late fall 2003 suggest that, at a minimum, the Georgia's Pre-K program has brought new attention to the quality of care for all young children.

Pre-K programs have the potential to enhance the quality of ECE generally by offering incentives for teacher education, providing more frequent technical assistance and monitoring, and requiring a curriculum and a system of child assessment for the purpose of improving instruction. At the same time, some have voiced concern that the expansion of preschool services could have the unintended consequence of diverting staff and resources from the already scarce supply of programs serving younger children. Efforts such as Georgia's to encourage participation in its preschool program by providers who also serve infants and toddlers help realize the full potential of universal preschool to upgrade the whole ECE system while guarding against these unintended consequences.

Quality preschool programs depend not only on individual program elements, such as teacher qualifications/ compensation and teacher-to-child ratios, but also on an infrastructure or support system.

Researchers note that there is a striking absence of a comprehensive infrastructure or support system to stand behind the delivery of early care and education services generally (Gallagher & Clifford, 2000; Kagan & Cohen, 1997). Elements of an infrastructure include personnel preparation, construction and renovation of facilities, technical assistance and quality assurance monitoring, and applied research and program evaluation to promote accountability.

In California and in other states interested in universal preschool, the hope is that the implementation of preschool for all will provide the impetus to create an infrastructure or support system that will benefit not only the preschool program per se, but also the entire nexus of early care and education.

The following tables are provided to help counties assess the elements of their existing preschool and other early care and education programs, and to begin planning their own goals for program improvement:

- Table 2-1 provides more information about research findings related to the program elements important for the provision of quality Preschool for All.
- Table 2-2 describes the program elements of existing publicly funded early care and education programs in California.
- Table 2-3 outlines the state's Title 5 and Title 22 provisions for early care and education programs as well as the federal standards for Head Start.
- Table 2-4 is a worksheet for local commissions and other local entities to begin designing the desired elements of their own Preschool for All program. For the sake of comparison, the worksheet lists the recommendations from the Superintendent's Universal Preschool Task Force Report, the Master Plan for Education School Readiness Workgroup, and the



First 5 California Children and Families Commission draft criteria for the Preschool for All Demonstration grants.



Table 2-1: Elements of Quality: What the Research Says

Program Element	Research Findings
Teacher Qualifications	<p>Teacher qualifications are key determinant of preschool quality & child outcomes. In Georgia Pre-K program, 80% of teachers have a BA or higher, and high quality of program was primary factor that gave Pre-K children a boost (Henry, 2003).</p> <p>Teacher characteristics most highly related to various measures of process quality are teacher education level & length of time since the teacher received the highest degree, with teachers who had been out of school longer being associated with lower overall quality (Henry, 2003)</p> <p>The higher the teacher's educational level, the better the observed classroom quality (Zill et al., 2001).</p> <p>Caregiver with BA or CDA promoted better language development (Howes, 1997)</p> <p>Staff education & training associated with better child language scores, controlling for family income & education (NICHD Early Childhood Research Network, 2000)</p> <p>Education & training specifically related to early childhood improves interactions between teachers & children (Bowman, et al., 2001; Howes, 1997)</p>
Teacher Compensation	<p>Staff wages are the strongest predictor of ECE quality (Whitebook et al., 1998; Whitebook, Phillips, & Howes, 1993)</p> <p>A study of 75 child care centers in California found that child care wages predicted a center's ability to maintain quality over time, with higher wages related to better long-term quality (Whitebook & Sakai, 2003)</p> <p>Teachers' wages, education levels & specialized training are the most important determinants in identifying poor, mediocre, & good quality centers (Helburn et al., 1995).</p> <p>Preschool teachers are poorly paid by any standard. Median salary of preschool teachers is \$21,332, less than half the median kindergarten teacher salary of \$43,152 (Barnett, 2003).</p> <p>Low teacher salaries linked to higher levels of staff turnover in child care & preschool (Helburn & Bergmann, 2002)</p>
Staff/Child Ratios; Group Size; Class Size	<p>Lower staff/child ratios (fewer children per adult) promote more sensitive & stimulating care (Vandell & Wolfe, 2000; Whitebook et al., 1990).</p> <p>Child care settings with lower staff-child ratios score higher on overall measures of quality on ECERS & ITES scales (Ibid.)</p> <p>Chicago Parent-Child Centers have 17-2 child-to-teacher ratio (Reynolds, 2001).</p> <p>Georgia Pre-K adult-child ratio is 1:10, with observed ratio of 1:9.6 (Reynolds, 2001). Observed class size was 18.</p>

Program Element	Research Findings
Length of Day/Year	<p>Mixed findings: Black children who attended Oklahoma pre-K program showed sharp gains on language and cognitive test scores, especially when they attended full-day (six hours per day) programs. In contrast, white children showed gains in language skills only when they were enrolled part-day (Gormley & Phillips, 2003).</p> <p>Chicago Parent-Child Centers – which showed positive results in 15-year-follow-up study – operate part-day (Reynolds, 2001). Georgia Pre-K Program operates 6 hours (full-school-day).</p> <p>Children who attend full-school-day rather than half-day <i>kindergarten</i> do better academically and socially during the primary grades (Gullo, 2000; Wang & Johnstone, 1999).</p> <p>Length of year is important to children's school readiness. When preschool is in recess during the summer months, children tend to lose a portion of what they have learned (Henry, 2003)</p>
Program Settings	<p>Chicago Parent-Child Centers serve 100-150 3-5-year-olds in separate facilities or in wings of neighborhood schools (Reynolds, 2001).</p> <p>30% of Georgia Pre-K programs located in schools; classes located within schools tended to score higher on measures of process quality (Henry, 2003). However, since almost all of the preschool classes in schools were Georgia Pre-K classes, research could not determine whether it was the school environment per se that has a positive influence on quality or whether the positive influence on quality was related to other aspects of the Georgia Pre-K program, such as technical assistance and monitoring.</p> <p>Trend is to include settings that are not exclusively school-based (child care centers, Head Start & nursery schools) (Mitchell, July 2001).</p>
Program Environment	<p>Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale- Revised (ECERS-R) includes characteristics of appropriate space and furnishing (Harms, Clifford & Cryer, 1998):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ample indoor space • Good ventilation that can be controlled • Space is accessible to children and adults with disabilities • Natural light can be controlled • Furniture is the right size for the age group • Furnishings for relaxation and comfort • Child-related display – where individual children's work predominates • Convenient space for gross motor play

Program Element	Research Findings
Curriculum/ Content Standards	<p>National Research Council found that “while no single curriculum or pedagogical approach can be identified as best, children who attend well-planned, high-quality early childhood programs in which curriculum aims are specified & integrated across domains tend to learn more & are better prepared” for school (Bowman et al., 2001).</p> <p>Children in programs that follow developmentally appropriate curriculum practices had more positive attitudes toward school and sustained their academic gains better compared with children in other programs (Helburn 1995, Whitebook et al., 1997).</p> <p>According to Head Start FACES study, Head Start had a meaningful impact on children's immediate intellectual development, social skills and health, but did not advance their knowledge of book and print conventions or letter-word identification, leading to recommendation that Head Start programs need to provide creative and developmentally appropriate initiatives to promote emergent literacy (Zill et al., 2001).</p> <p>The strongest predictor of first grade reading, of all traditional factors related to school readiness, is a child's alphabet knowledge (Committee on Prevention of Reading Difficulties in Young Children, 1998).</p> <p>Phonological awareness appears to predict future reading ability (Ibid.).</p>
Accreditation, Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale, & Other Program Standards/ Benchmarks	<p>National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) accreditation criteria closely match aspects of child care that have been shown to predict better language skills & cognitive development, as well as behavioral & emotional adjustment in children (McCartney, 1984; Effect of quality of day care environment on children's language development. Developmental Psychology, 20, 244-260; NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (2000)</p> <p>In a northern California study, NAEYC accredited centers were much more likely to provide high-quality care than were the non-NAEYC-accredited centers, but almost 40 percent of all accredited centers were still mediocre in quality (Whitebook et al., 1997). In addition, a follow-up study indicated that accredited centers with a higher percentage of well-trained staff were most likely to sustain quality over a period of four years (Whitebook, Sakai, Howes, & Gerber, 2001).</p> <p>The Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale- Revised defines environment broadly to include spatial, programmatic and interpersonal features that directly affect the children and adults in an early childhood setting. The seven subscales are: Space and Furnishing, Personal Care Routines, Language-Reasoning, Activities, Interaction, Program Structure and Parents and Staff. An ECERS-R score of 5 or more indicates that the quality of the preschool classroom is between “good” & “excellent”. More than 1/3 of Georgia Pre-k classes & about ¼ of Head Start classes achieved this standard, while 1 in 30 private preschool classrooms not participating in Georgia Pre-K Program achieved this rating (Henry, 2003).</p> <p>Based on Caregiver Interaction Scale (CIS), Georgia Pre-K teachers were significantly more sensitive in their relationships with children than were teachers in Head Start or in private preschools not participating in Georgia Pre-K Program (Henry, 2003).</p>
Child Assessment	<p>School readiness requires cognitive skills, social-emotional behavior, communication & language skills, and good health. Assessing the readiness of young children for school requires multiple indicators (Henry, 2003; Peisner-Feinberg et al., 2000; Schweinhart & Weikart, 1997)</p> <p>There are multiple purposes of child assessment – developmental screening to identify children in need of further assessment for possible identification of special needs, developmental profiles for purposes of improving instruction, and measurement of child outcomes for purposes of program evaluation. So single assessment instrument will satisfy all three purposes (Meisels *& Atkins-Burnett, 2000; Shepard, Kagan & Wurtz, 2001; Muenchow 2003).</p>

Program Element	Research Findings
Inclusion of Children with Special Needs	<p>Early care and education benefits children with special needs in many of the same ways it benefits other children (Guralnick, 1976).</p> <p>However, children with special needs are less likely to be in early care and education & begin it at older ages (Warfield & Hauser-Cram, 1996).</p> <p>Specialized instruction is an important component of inclusion (Odom, 2003)</p> <p>Inclusive preschool programs can benefit children with and without disabilities (Odom, 2003); families of children with disabilities and those of typically developing children felt that one of the greatest benefits was exposing children to the “real” world and acceptance of children with disabilities (Bailey & Winton, 1987).</p> <p>Inclusive programs do not cost more than traditional, non-inclusive special education programs (Odom, 2003)</p>
Culturally & Linguistically Appropriate	<p>There is evidence from preschool programs suggesting that the use of the child’s native language in preschool settings does not impede the acquisition of English, but more studies are needed to understand the effects of the linguistic environments of institutional settings that serve as the primary base for acquisition of English (August & Hakuta, 1997).</p> <p>English language learners in Head Start show gains in school readiness & in their knowledge of English by the end of the Head Start year (Zill et al., 2001).</p>
Comprehensive Services	<p>Featured program in longitudinal study – the Chicago Parent-Child Centers-- includes a parent-resource teacher to coordinate family-support services, and a multi-faceted parent program that includes educational workshops, parent resource room, opportunities to complete high school, home visitation, and child health services, including health screening, speech therapy. Important to note that program was targeted to children from low-income families in a high-poverty neighborhood (Reynolds et al., 2001)</p>
Family Involvement	<p>Parent agreement to participate was a condition of Chicago Parent-Child Center (Reynolds, 2001).</p> <p>Children whose parents were more involved in their preschool in the Georgia Pre-K program scored higher on all assessments of pre-math problem solving, letter-word recognition, vocabulary, story & print comprehension, & basic skills mastery (Henry, 2003).</p>
Infrastructure	<p>In recommendations in <i>Not By Chance</i> for creating an early care and education system, Kagan & Cohen (1997) recommend that at least 10 percent of all public early care & education funds should be invested directly in “infrastructure/quality enhancement,” including support for parent involvement, data collection, evaluation, governance, professional development, licensing, accreditation, and development of innovative approaches for facilities. However, it is not clear whether this percentage would be sufficient to support as strong an emphasis on workforce development as is now envisioned to provide one teacher with a bachelor’s degree in early care and education or child development for every 20 preschool children. See also below.</p>

Program Element	Research Findings
Workforce Development	<p>States cite T.E.A.C.H. initiative as their number one accomplishment in career development in ECE (Wheelock College Institute for Leadership & Career Initiatives, 2002)</p> <p>Level of education of ECE workforce in 8 California counties similar to that of respective population in county, ranging from 43% in San Francisco to 8% in Kern County (Whitebook, Kipnis, Sakai, Voisin & Young, 2004).</p> <p>While 30% of California's State Preschool staff in public school settings had earned a BA, only 8 percent of their counterparts in privately operated State Preschools had done so (Bellm et al, 2002). Need to address parity with public school benefits as well as salaries.</p> <p>Challenges in California include the following: There is no centralized registry of early care and education teachers, no ongoing collection of administrative data, and no universal certification system that would lead to accurate assessments of the size of the workforce (Bellm & Whitebook, 2003). In addition, higher education capacity to meet increased professional development needs varies widely.</p>



Table 2-2: Existing Publicly Funded Early Care and Education Programs

	State Preschool	General Child Care & Development Programs	Head Start	Alternative Payment Program	CalWORKS Child Care Stage 2 and 3
General Description	Usually a part-day, part-year program that emphasizes basic preschool education and parent education with health, nutrition, and social services.	Typically a year-round program for up to 10 hours per day. Educational program plus nutrition, parent education, and referrals for social services.	Typically a part-day, part-year program. Educational, health, medical, dental, nutritional and mental health services.	Child care vouchers to help parents work and accommodate the individual needs of family.	Child care arrangements to help CalWORKS recipients engage in work and/or work preparation activities.
Administrative mechanism/ Program Settings	CDE contracts with local educational agencies, colleges, community action agencies and private non-profit agencies	CDE contracts with centers and family child care home networks, administered by either public or private agencies and local educational agencies.	Federal Administration for Children and Families contracts with grantees that either directly operate or contract with delegate agencies to operate programs. Use both centers and family child care settings.	AP vouchers to help pay for child care selected by family.	R&R program helps Stage 2 CalWORKS families identify provider. AP program typically pays provider.
Standards*	Title 5	Title 5 and Title 22 Licensing Regulations	Head Start Performance Standards	Title 22 if licensed	Title 22 if licensed
Age Group	Preschool children ages 3-5 First priority to child protective services children Then priority to eligible 4-year-olds.	Infants to 12	Preschool children ages 3-5, with priority to 4-year-olds. (Early Head Start serves infants and toddlers in some communities.)	Infants to 12	Infants to 12
Income & Other Requirements	Families with incomes up to 60% of State Median Income (SMI), Up to 10% of participants can qualify up to 75% of SMI. Families with lowest adjusted monthly income shall be admitted first.	Families with incomes up to 75% SMI & demonstrated need	Families with incomes up to 100% of poverty. All CalWORKs & Supplemental Services Insurance (S.S.I.) are automatically eligible.	Families with incomes up to 75% of SMI and with demonstrated need. CalWORKS participants and up to 75% SMI with demonstrated need.	Stage 2: Limited to first 2 years after the family stops receiving CalWORKS. Stage 3: Families remain eligible for as long as they meet income requirements and demonstrated need for other child care programs.

*See Table 2-3 for the content of the various sets of standards.

Table 2-3: Existing Early Care and Education Program Standards

	California Program Standards for Contract Providers (Title 5)	Federal Head Start Performance Standards	California Child Care Licensing Requirements (Title 22)
Programs Subject to Standards	State Preschool Contracted General Child Care & Development Programs	Head Start; Early Head Start	Child Care Centers Family Child Care Homes (Includes non-exempt providers receiving Alternative Payment and CalWORKS funds)
Minimum Teacher Qualifications	24 units of Early Childhood Education or Child Development and 16 general education units	50% of Head Start teachers must have AA or higher in Early Childhood Education or related field by September 2003; otherwise a Child Development Associate (CDA) or a state-awarded certificate for preschool teachers that meets or exceeds requirements for CDA Head Start Reauthorization Act passed by House requires that 50% of teachers have BA by 2008	12 units of Early Childhood Education or Child Development or CDA for teacher s in center-based programs. No ECE requirements for family child care; providers are required to take health and safety training. Also, family child care providers who take appropriate courses and meet other requirements are eligible to obtain Child Care Permits (e.g., teacher, master teacher, etc.)
Staff/Child Ratios; Group Size; Class Size	1:8 for 3-5 year-olds Maximum group Size of 24 1:4 for Toddlers Maximum group Size of 16 1:3 for Infants Maximum group size of 18	1:10 for 4- and 5-year-olds Maximum group size of 20 2:17 for 3-year-olds Maximum class size of 17	Centers: 1:12 for 2-5 year-olds 1:6 for toddlers (option) 1:4 for infants Small Family Child Care Homes: Maximum # of children is 6-8 under age 10, depending upon age of child, including provider's own children. Large family child care home: Maximum # of children is 12-14, depending upon age of the child and including providers' own children, with 2 adults
Curriculum	No set curriculum; <i>Pre-kindergarten Learning & Development Guidelines</i> provide guidance on curriculum on various developmental domains.	No set curriculum; Head Start programs must implement a curriculum that supports cognitive development, age appropriate literacy, numeracy, social and emotional development and other skills that form the foundation for school readiness; must integrate all educational aspects of health, nutrition, mental health services into program activities	No set curriculum; <i>Prekindergarten Guidelines</i> provide guidance on curriculum on various developmental domains.
Monitoring & Technical Assistance	Monitoring conducted at contract agency level every 3 years. Annual self-study plan using Coordinated Compliance/Contract Monitoring Review with ITERS and ECERS rating scales.	Technical assistance and monitoring based on Head Start Performance Standards; in-depth monitoring every 3 years.	Annual site visits for center compliance with licensing standards conducted by Department of Social Services. Site visits every 5 years for family child care to ensure compliance with licensing standards; more frequent for "high risk" homes.
Comprehensive Services	Health & social service component that identifies needs of child & family for health or social services makes referrals & includes follow-up and nutrition component.	Federal Head Start Performance Standards provide a range of services to address nutritional, health, and mental health needs; provide opportunities to include parents; and provide medical, dental, nutrition & mental health programs.	Comprehensive services not required.

Table 2-4: Preschool for All Program Elements Worksheet

Program Element*	Superintendent's Universal Preschool Task Force Report Recommendations (1998)	Master Plan for Education School Readiness Work Group Recommendations (2002)	Draft FIRST 5 Preschool for All Demonstration Grant Criteria (2003)	Local Commission Plan
Teacher Qualifications	<p>Master teacher with BA or higher in ECE/CD, including at least 200 hours of supervised field work with preschool children, or a BA (not ECE/CD) + 24 units of ECE/CD and at least 200 hours of supervised field work with preschool children</p> <p>Teacher with AA or higher with 3 semester units of supervised field experience</p> <p>The shift to staff certification will take time.</p>	<p>State should adopt more rigorous education requirements & certification standards for all individuals who teach young children in center-based settings or who supervise others who care for young children, & should immediately require a minimum program of state-approved professional development for all publicly funded providers of care to young children.</p>	<p>Teachers in Demonstration Projects must, at a minimum, meet State Preschool Standards & Child Development Permit Matrix requirements.</p> <p>Demonstration Project must have a plan for all preschool master teachers to have a BA in early childhood education/child development with criteria listed in the UPK Task Force Report (1998) within 5 years, and an Early Education credential (new) within 10 years.</p>	
Teacher Compensation	<p>Compensation should be linked to education levels & experience. Pay for teachers should be at parity for K-12 teachers.</p>	<p>Salaries & benefits for early childhood education providers who have backgrounds similar to, & perform functions similar to, those of their public school colleagues, must be made commensurate to compensation in the K-12 sector, if California is to establish a professional early childhood education sector as part of a coherent system of education</p>	<p>Teachers will be compensated according to qualifications, with goal being parity with K-12 salaries.</p> <p>Preschool rates will increase incrementally based on improvements in teacher education to reach parity with kindergarten/early elementary teachers. Teacher training for preschool will be integrated with the IHE systems for teacher training and include community-based training venues.</p>	

Program Element*	Superintendent's Universal Preschool Task Force Report Recommendations (1998)	Master Plan for Education School Readiness Work Group Recommendations (2002)	Draft FIRST 5 Preschool for All Demonstration Grant Criteria (2003)	Local Commission Plan
Staff/Child Ratios; Group Size; Class Size	<p>Ratios & group size are important, but do not alone define quality. Acceptable group sizes and staff-child ratios must be determined in relation to staff qualifications.</p> <p>Reasonable guidelines: Master teacher, teacher, assistant teacher 3:24 or Master teacher, teacher 2:20, or Master teacher 1:8</p> <p>Programs that include children with special needs may require an enhanced ratio of adults to children.</p>	<p>Uniform set of program standards, including appropriate staff-child ratios & group size not to exceed 20</p>	<p>Staff-to-child ratios do not exceed State Preschool Requirements (3:24) or a research-based alternative (e.g., 2:20 with a master teacher who has a BA in an ECE-related field & credential, a teacher with an AA, and additional staff and volunteers including parents)</p> <p>Group sizes are small, implementing recommendations of Master Plan for Education and UPK Task Force Report</p>	
Length of Day/Length of Year & Linkage to Extended Day	<p>Focus on publicly funding early education that emphasizes school readiness and that, like kindergarten, is provided for one-half day during the school year.</p> <p>Establish extensions and connections with year-round providers to offer full-day child care.</p> <p>Families should pay, according to a sliding scale, for extended hours of child care beyond the half-day preschool program.</p> <p>Determine what is needed to maximize the number of preschools that provide or coordinate with others to provide extended hours/days of child care needed by working parents.</p>	<p>Recommended that law should be changed to require full-school day kindergarten for all children.</p>	<p>Publicly fund 3.5 hours per day operating on a 175-day school year or an equivalent plan that provides 612.5 hours over a full year, e.g., 2.5 hours per day for 245 days.</p> <p>Providing connections to full day, full year child care services when needed.</p> <p>Integrate wrap-around child care services with current high quality child care providers with minimal transitions for children and families. Use a variety of public and private funding mechanisms, including parent fees, to support wrap-around services.</p> <p>Plan must address the extended day/year needs of families (as state First 5 Preschool for All funds will not be used to support them).</p> <p>Plan must work to embed Preschool Program in systems of child care for children 0-5.</p>	

Program Element*	Superintendent's Universal Preschool Task Force Report Recommendations (1998)	Master Plan for Education School Readiness Work Group Recommendations (2002)	Draft FIRST 5 Preschool for All Demonstration Grant Criteria (2003)	Local Commission Plan
Program Settings	<p>Make universal preschool available in a variety of settings:</p> <p>Eligible providers should include current State Preschool and General Child Care Providers, school-based programs, center-based child development providers, & family child care providers that can meet proposed standards.</p> <p>All licensed public & private child development providers who meet the state's universal preschool standards & accreditation criteria should be invited to participate as funds become available.</p>		<p>Provide preschool services through formal agreements between local education agencies & variety of public & private providers, including preschools, centers, & large family child care homes in networks that meet preschool standards.</p> <p>Facilities should be clean, safe, accessible, inclusive, licensed, and well-equipped with sufficient, appropriate materials and toys</p>	
Curriculum/ Content Standards	<p>Support content & performance standards designed to enhance children's social-emotional, cognitive, linguistic, & physical development</p> <p>Offer many structured learning activities that support children's emerging literacy & numeracy skills, socialization skills necessary to promote a successful transition to kindergarten</p> <p>Developmentally appropriate curriculum practices that promote more positive attitudes and sustained academic gains</p>	<p>Align preschool and kindergarten standards, curricula, & services -- includes making kindergarten more developmentally appropriate</p> <p>.</p>	<p>Use developmentally appropriate curricula with specific learning objectives based on <i>Pre-kindergarten Learning & Development Guidelines</i> – early literacy, visual and performing arts, science, math, physical activity, health/nutrition, social skills/relationship building, & group activities</p>	

Program Element*	Superintendent's Universal Preschool Task Force Report Recommendations (1998)	Master Plan for Education School Readiness Work Group Recommendations (2002)	Draft FIRST 5 Preschool for All Demonstration Grant Criteria (2003)	Local Commission Plan
Accreditation, Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale & Other Program Standards/Benchmarks	Accreditation system similar to that of NAEYC should be implemented.		<p>Participating school-based and center-based programs must receive acceptable score on ECERS.</p> <p>Participating family child care homes that are part of contracted family child care home networks must have acceptable scores on FDCRS.</p> <p>Positive relationship between teachers and children.</p> <p>USDA Childcare Food Standards for meals & snacks</p>	
Child Assessment	A developmental profile should be prepared soon after enrollment and at regular intervals, such as quarterly. The profile should be based on ongoing observations of the child.	<p>Use Desired Results for framework in setting expectations for children.</p> <p>Require individualized learning plans for each child, developed in partnership with family, and based on child/family assessment</p>	<p>The purposes of child care assessment must be clarified: (1) To identify children who may need to be referred for a more in-depth assessment to determine if they have special needs; (2) To improve program design and instruction; and (3) To provide data for evaluation. No one instrument will satisfy all three purposes.</p> <p>To address purpose #1, preschools will provide developmental screenings for all children & connection to appropriate intervention & treatment.</p> <p>To address purpose #2, preschools should use Desired Results as framework for setting expectations for children and providing information to improve curriculum.</p> <p>To address purpose #3 (program evaluation), a more in-depth battery of pre- and post-assessment measures is suggested for a sample of children participating. Longitudinal follow-up of children's API scores is also suggested.</p>	

Program Element*	Superintendent's Universal Preschool Task Force Report Recommendations (1998)	Master Plan for Education School Readiness Work Group Recommendations (2002)	Draft FIRST 5 Preschool for All Demonstration Grant Criteria (2003)	Local Commission Plan
Inclusion of Children with Special Needs	Program should include children with disabilities.	Preventive health screenings & assessments to reveal signs of developmental delays or physical problems that put children 'at risk' in developing readiness for school	Preschools will provide affirmative inclusion for children with disabilities or other special needs, including an appropriate set-aside of resources and/or other funding. Programs include children with disabilities and other special needs As noted above, programs will include required developmental screenings to ensure that special needs are identified and that children receive appropriate services.	
Culturally & Linguistically Appropriate	Assess culturally, linguistically & developmentally appropriate programming options & provided necessary program modifications	Promote dual language learning; provide learning activities that reflect state's diverse cultures. Early childhood settings should help all children establish the foundation to become bilingual & bi-literate	Programs will appropriately serve children with diverse languages and cultures Materials & activities to promote understanding & acceptance of diversity. First 5 'Equity Principles' implemented & assessed.	
Comprehensive Services	Coordinate with other providers to make nutrition, health, & social services available for families who need such services, using the funds targeted for those purposes.	Provide funding to establish neighborhood-based School Readiness Centers to give families access to essential services to meet young children's developmental needs.	Coordinate with other providers to make health & social services available. Preschool programs should be coordinated with First 5 School Readiness programs, which emphasize health, social services and family involvement as well as early care and education and schools being ready for children.	
Family Involvement	Formal family involvement and education component	Schools should establish & maintain explicit compacts for active & meaningful partnerships that make parents & parent groups full partners in the education of their children	Preschools will invite and support parent and family partnership, including leadership in program design & implementation.	

Program Element*	Superintendent's Universal Preschool Task Force Report Recommendations (1998)	Master Plan for Education School Readiness Work Group Recommendations (2002)	Draft FIRST 5 Preschool for All Demonstration Grant Criteria (2003)	Local Commission Plan
Family Involvement (continued)		<p>Develop an equitable per-child allocation for financing early care & education.</p> <p>Model should fund the organizational infrastructure of the new early care & education system, including professional development, quality improvement & data collection.</p>	<p>Approximately 10% (\$10 million) of the \$100 million Preschool Demonstration Grant funds over 4 years will be set aside for the development of quality improvements including workforce development, administration & monitoring, training & technical assistance, & evaluation.</p> <p>Counties asked to match these funds on a 4:1 basis.</p>	

*See Table 2-1 for research findings on each program element.

Section 2 Appendix

Appendix 2-1: English Language Learners Focus Group Report: Identifying Strategies to Support English Language Learners in Head Start and Early Head Start Programs

The following is a list of recommendations regarding strategies to support English Language Learners in Head Start and Early Head Start programs. It is taken from a report that was the product of a two-day focus group hosted by the Head Start Bureau in Washington, D.C. on April 8-9, 2002.

Curriculum and Instruction

- Create and implement demonstration pilot programs of dual language instructional models and optional bilingual and multilingual education strategies, to promote first language development and second language acquisition for both English learners and English speakers.
- Promote the implementation of culturally and linguistically appropriate curricula to support children and families.

Child Assessment

- Support the development of age appropriate performance-based assessment measures in the child's home language to be conducted by staff who speak those languages.
- Employ multiple measures of assessment such as portfolios of children's work, observation, ongoing assessment, and parent input.

Qualified Staff

- Increase the recruitment of qualified bilingual and English as a Second Language staff at all levels and create incentives for their retention through continuing education, ongoing professional development, and pay differential.
- Hire qualified staff of each language of instruction whenever possible.
- Promote the efforts to hire bilingual and English as a Second Language speech pathologists to prevent inappropriate diagnosis of language and speech difficulties of children who are English language learners.

Staff Training

- Offer research-based professional development for new and experienced teachers, teacher assistants, home visitors, education managers, parents, administrators, other service providers, and caregivers on topics such as:
 - theory and practice of second language acquisition for children birth to five;
 - effective teaching and learning techniques that impact language and cognitive development;
 - early literacy skills;

- observation and assessment of English language learners;
 - cultural influences in child-rearing practices;
 - designing and creating effective language and literacy rich learning environments;
 - inter-cultural sensitivity and awareness;
 - child and family literacy for English language learners;
 - culturally and linguistically appropriate curriculum design and implementation; and
 - observation, documentation, and assessment aligned with curriculum as defined in the Head Start Program Performance Standards and the Head Start Child Outcomes Framework.
- Establish partnerships with institutions of higher learning that can provide college credit incentives to improve bilingual and English as a Second Language teacher qualifications and enhance ongoing professional development for staff in this field.
 - Develop and support funding and initiatives that offer bilingual, dual language, and English as a Second Language early childhood teacher preparation.

Partnering with Parents

- Share information with parents about the current research regarding how the process of first and second language acquisition takes place and their important role in it.
- Inform parents of ways to support their children's language development and learning, using the home language as the basis for the development of English, without compromising their first language and culture.

National Leadership

- Build the Head Start Bureau's capacity to serve as a visible national leader in offering guidance and resources in the area of bilingual and multilingual early childhood first and second language development and learning for children birth to five.
- Establish partnerships with other federal agencies and organizations in the area of second language acquisition for young children.
- Articulate and clarify existing Head Start policy that supports and promotes the need for linguistic and cultural continuity between children and families and program-home interactions and communication in Head Start and Early Head Start programs.

Research

- Develop additional research initiatives on the bilingual, dual language, and multilingual development of children birth to five and the preparation of personnel and skilled leaders in this area.
- Establish partnerships that can help to identify, evaluate, and assist with the development, replication of methods, best practices, and approaches to improve the early literacy development of birth to five English language learners.



Appendix 2-1: Areas of General Agreement on Preschool for All Developed July 2003 by *First 5 California Commission on Children and Families* in Collaboration with County Commissions and other RFP Partners

Long-Term Goals:

- Preschool, including current early care and education programs that will meet quality standards, will be an integrated part of California's system of free public education.
- Preschool teacher education and compensation will increase to parity with Kindergarten/ Early Elementary teachers.
- Preschool will be administered by the CDE and connected with K-12 education. CDE will provide for the development of training and standards while facilitating preschool systems that build on local capacity and meet local needs.

First 5 Demonstration Projects:

- Criteria for the First 5 PFA Demonstration Projects will provide a common framework regarding readiness to start, including specified partners, and additional criteria for build-up/roll-out to a statewide system (i.e., selected demonstration projects demonstrate their commitment to change as necessary to become a statewide system).
- Preschools will provide benefits to young children that are measurable across the 5 domains of children's learning and development through the early elementary grades.
- Preschools will appropriately serve children with diverse languages and cultures, as well as provide affirmative inclusion for children with disabilities and other special needs (goal - at least 10% of children served have disabilities or other special needs).
- Preschool will be free to all, voluntary, and offered for at least one-half day during the regular school year.
- Preschool will reflect research-based, high quality standards and build on programs provided through a variety of public and private settings that meet those standards, including networks of family child care homes.



- Preschool will be a viable option for all families by providing connections to full day, full year child care services when needed. The wrap-around child care services will be integrated with current high quality child care providers with minimal transitions for children and families. A variety of public and private funding mechanisms, including fees, will be used to support wrap-around child care services.
- Preschool rates will increase incrementally based on improvements in teacher education (and compensation) to reach parity with Kindergarten/ Early Elementary teachers and other early educators. Teacher training for preschool will be integrated with the IHE systems for teacher training and include community-based training venues.
- Preschools will invite and support parent and family partnership, including leadership in program design and implementation.
- Preschools will provide for transitions for 0-3 year olds entering the preschool programs and for preschoolers entering Kindergarten. Preschools will be part of an integrated infrastructure (workforce, facilities, etc.) spanning birth through school-age programs.
- Preschools will be provided in appropriate facilities that are clean, safe, accessible, inclusive, licensed, meet regulatory quality standards, and are well-equipped with sufficient, appropriate materials and toys.
- County Commissions will have time and resources to work at the county or school district level to plan and implement Preschool for All Demonstration Projects with support from a variety of partners.



Appendix 2-3: Draft Working Principles for Preschool for All

Developed by early childhood representatives convened by and under the guidance of *Preschool California* and *Children Now*, with support from the David and Lucile Packard Foundation.

Goal: To achieve voluntary preschool programs that prepare children for a smooth transition to kindergarten and for success in life, available to all three- and four-year-olds whose families choose to enroll them; these programs shall:

- Meet standards for quality;
- Attract and retain professionals who are educated and compensated at levels comparable to teachers in California's K-12 system;
- Take place in a variety of settings, including public and private child care centers and family child care homes, Head Start programs and schools;
- Be offered in culturally, ethnically and linguistically appropriate settings and developed in concert with an infrastructure for educating a culturally, ethnically and linguistically diverse workforce;
- Be inclusive of children with special needs;
- Link to full-day, affordable early care and education programs to meet the needs of working families; and
- Be publicly funded.

Principles of a California Preschool for All System:

Quality Standards Will Support Children's Early Development

All California families will have the opportunity to enroll their three- and four-year-old children in a publicly funded, quality preschool program that meets research-based standards that support children's social, emotional, cognitive, linguistic and physical development.

Early Childhood Educators Will Be Well Educated, Fairly Compensated and Culturally, Ethnically and Linguistically Reflective of the Children Served

Early education professionals will be educated and compensated at levels comparable to teachers in California's K-12 system, and will engage in ongoing professional development. All staff working with children will have access to professional development opportunities. Early education professionals will be representative of the cultural, ethnic and linguistic diversity of California's children.

Programs Will Match Families' Needs

Children's families will be able to communicate easily with preschool teachers and feel welcome to participate fully in their children's early learning experiences. Families will have access to quality programs with settings, locations, hours and other characteristics that meet family needs and preferences and support families' aspirations to fulfill their children's potential. Programs will be linked to community resources supporting the healthy development of children and families. The part-day preschool experience will be made feasible for working families by being incorporated into or connecting with full-day care as seamlessly as possible.

Programs Will Recognize that Cultural, Ethnic and Linguistic Diversity Are Defining Attributes of California's Population

Children of all cultural and ethnic backgrounds, first languages, income levels and areas of residence shall be welcomed in inclusive quality programs designed to meet their individual needs.

Programs Will be Inclusive of Children with Special Needs and/or Disabilities

All children benefit from inclusive programs. Elements that promote inclusion of children with disabilities will be integrated into the planning and design of programs, rate structures, new facilities, and staff training programs. In addition, strong links will be built in every community to ensure that early identification and appropriate services are available to children with disabilities, and that there will be access to training and resources for parents and providers.

Programs Will be Regularly Evaluated to Assure that Desired Outcomes for Children Are Met

Programs will be accountable for engaging in regular quality assessments and uniform evaluation tools statewide to measure their progress in meeting desired outcomes for children. These evaluation tools will be developmentally, culturally, ethnically, and linguistically appropriate.

Financing Will Support the Cost of Quality Programs

Children will be in programs that are sufficiently funded to meet the real cost of a quality early childhood education program. This includes meeting established standards, providing comparable pay and benefits for qualified teachers, establishing an accessible higher education infrastructure for the preparation of the early childhood workforce, developing facilities suitable for quality early childhood education, and engaging in ongoing quality assessment activities. Financing of preschool should not negatively impact funding for infants, toddlers and school-age children nor child care subsidies that help low-income families to work.

Administration Will be Streamlined and Articulate Well with Other Relevant Systems

Preschool for all will be administered at the state level by the California Department of Education to assure articulation with California's K-12 education system. Locally, preschool for all will be responsive to the varying needs of California's communities, and parents will be involved in planning the preschool for all system. Statewide and locally, preschool for all will be administered in ways that connect to systems serving infants and toddlers and those providing full-day, full-year services for children of all ages. Wherever possible, infrastructure, such as training programs, will be built to serve the entire system.

Additional Resources:

Final Report: The California Master Plan for Education. Available at:
www.sen.ca.gov/masterplan/

National Association for the Education of Young Children website:
www.naeyc.org/

National Center for Early Development and Learning website:
<http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~ncedl/>

National Institute for Early Education Research website:
www.nieer.org/

Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute website:
<http://www.fpg.unc.edu>

The High/Scope Foundation website:
www.highscope.org

Early Childhood Research Institute on Inclusion (ECRII)
<http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~ecrii>

Department of Education No Child Left Behind website:
<http://www.nclb.gov>

References

- Ackerman, D. (2003). States' Efforts in Improving the Qualifications of Early Care and Education Teachers. New Brunswick, NJ: NIEER.
- Bailey, D.B., & Winton, P. (1987) Stability and Change in Parents' Expectations about Mainstreaming. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 7, 73-88
- Barnett, W.S., & Hustedt, J.T. (2003). Preschool: The Most Important Grade. *Educational Leadership*, 60 (7), 54-57.
- Bellm, D., Burton, A., Whitebook, M. Broatch, L. & Young, M. (2002). Inside the Pre-K Classroom: A Study of Staffing and Stability in State-Funded Prekindergarten Programs. Washington, D. C.: Center for the Child Care Workforce.
- Bowman, B., Donovan, M., & Burns, M. (Eds.) (2001). *Eager to Learn: Educating Our Preschoolers*. National Research Council, Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Gallagher, J. & Clifford, R. (2000). The Missing Support Infrastructure in Early Childhood. *Early Childhood Research and Practice*, 2 (1), 1-24.
- Gormley, W.T., Jr. & Phillips, D. (2003). *The Effects of Universal Pre-K in Oklahoma: Research Highlights and Policy Implications*. Crocus Working Paper #2. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University. www.crocus.georgetown.edu/oklahoma.html.
- Gullo, D. (2000). The Long-Term Educational Effects of Half-Day versus Full-School-Day Kindergarten. *Early Child Development and Care*, 160:17-24.
- Guralnick, M.J. (1976). The Value of Integrating Handicapped and Non-handicapped Preschool Children. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 46: 236-245.
- Guralnick, M.J. (1998) The Effectiveness of Early Intervention for Vulnerable Children. *American Journal of Mental Retardation*, 102: 319-345.
- Harms, T., Clifford, R., & Cryer, D. (1998) *Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale-Revised Edition*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Helburn, S.W. & the Cost, Quality and Child Outcomes Study Team. (1995). *Cost, Quality and Child Outcomes in Child Care Centers* (Public Report, 2nd. Ed.). Denver: Center for Research in Economic and Social Policy, University of Colorado Economics Department.
- Helburn, S.W. & Bergmann, B.R. (2002) *America's Childcare Problem: The Way Out*. New York: Palgrave.

Henry, G.T., Henderson, L.W., Ponder, B.D., Gordon, C.S., Mashburn, A.J., & Rickman, D.K. (2003). *Report of the Findings from the Early Childhood Study: 2001-2002*. Atlanta: Georgia State University, Andrew Young School of Policy Studies. Report available at www.gsu.edu/sps/publications/2003/earlychildhood.htm.

Howes, C. (1997). Children's Experiences in Center-Based Child Care as a Function of Teacher Background and Adult-Child Ratio, *Merrill Palmer Quarterly*, 43: 404-425.

Kagan, S.L. & Cohen, N.E. (1997) *Not By Chance: Creating an Early Care and Education System for America's Children*. New Haven: Yale University, Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy.

Lombardi, J. (2003) *Time to Care: Redesigning Child Care*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

McCartney, K. (1984). Effect of Quality of Day Care Environment on Children's Language Development. *Developmental Psychology*, 20, 244-260.

Meisels, S.J. & Atkins-Burnett, S. (2000). The Elements of Early Childhood Assessment. In J.P. Shonkoff & S.J. Meisels (Eds.), *Handbook of Early Childhood Intervention*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mitchell, A. (2001). *Prekindergarten Programs in the States: Trends and Issues*. Manuscript available from Early Childhood Policy Research, Climax, NY 12042.

Muenchow, S. (2003). A Risk Management Approach to Readiness Assessment. In Scott-Little, C., Kagan, S.L., & Clifford, R.M. (Eds.). *Assessing the State of State Assessment: Perspectives on Assessing Young Children*. Greensboro, N.C.: The Regional Educational Laboratory at SERVE, Associated with the School of Education, University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

National Institute for Child Health and Development Early Child Care Research Network (2000). The relation of child care to cognitive and language development. *Child Development*, 71 (4), 960-980.

Odom, S. (2003) *Widening the Circle: Including Children with Disabilities in Preschool Settings*. <http://www.indiana.edu/~edfolks/persons/slodom.html>

Peisner-Feinberg, E., Burchinal, M., Clifford, R., Culkin, M., Howes, C., Kagan, S., & Yazejian, N. (2001). The relation of preschool child-care quality to children's cognitive and social development trajectories through second grade. *Child Development*, 72 (5), 1534-1553.

Reynolds, A., Temple, J.A., Robertson, D.L., & Mann, E.A. (2001). Long-Term Effects of an Early Intervention on Educational Achievement and Juvenile Arrest: A 15-Year Follow-Up of Low-Income Children in Public School. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 285: 2339-2346.

Schumacher, R., Irish, K., & Lombardi, J. (2003). *Meeting Great Expectations: Integrating Early Education Program Standards in Child Care*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Law and Social Policy.

Schweinhart, L. & Weikart, D. (1997) *Lasting Differences: The High/Scope Preschool Curriculum Comparison Study Through Age 23*. Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Press.

Shepard, L., Kagan, S.L., & Wurtz, E. (2001) Principles and Recommendations for Early Childhood Assessments. *The State Education Standard*, 2 (2), 5-12.

Shonkoff, J., & Phillips, D. (Eds.) (2000). *From Neurons to Neighborhoods: The science of early child development*. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press.

Snow, C.E., Burns, S.M., & Griffin, P. (Eds.) (1998) *Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children*. Washington, D.C.: National Research Council.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (2002). *To Assure the Free Appropriate Public Education of all Children with Disabilities*. 24th Annual Report to Congress on the progress of special education. Report can be found at www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/osep/2002/index.html As cited in “Early Intervention Helps Special E. Students, Report Says,” *Education Week*, September 24, 2003.

Vandell, D. & Wolfe, B. (2000). *Child Care Quality: Does It Matter and Does It Need to Be Improved?* Report prepared for the United States Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation. Observational Record of the Caregiving Environment (ORCE)-NICHD. Retrieved from <http://www.aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/ccquality00/ccqual.htm>.

Wang, Y.L. & Johnstone, G.W. (1999). Evaluation of a Full-School-Day Kindergarten Program, *ERS Spectrum*, 17(2): 27-32.

Warfield, M.E., & Hauser-Cram, P. (1996). Child Care Needs, Arrangement, and Satisfaction of Children with Developmental Disabilities. *Mental Retardation*, 34:294-302.

Whitebook, M., Howes, C., & Phillips, D. (1998) *Worthy Work, Unlivable Wages: The National Child Care Staffing Study, 1988-1997*. Washington, D.C.: The Center for the Child Care Workforce.

Whitebook, M. & Sakai, L. (2003) Turnover Begets Turnover: An Examination of Job and Occupational Stability Among Child Care Center Staff. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 18 (3): 273-293.

Whitebook, M., Sakai, L., & Howes, C. (1997) *NAEYC Accreditation as a Strategy for Improving Child Care Quality*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for the Early Childhood Workforce.

Whitebook, M., Howes, C., & Phillips, D. (1990). *Who Cares? Child Care Teachers and the Quality of Care in America*. Final Report of the National Child Care Staffing Study. Oakland, CA: Child Care Employees Project.

Whitebook, M., Phillips, D. & Howes, C. (1993). *National Child Care Staffing Study Revisited: Four Years in the Life of Center-Based Child Care*. Oakland: Child Care Employee Project.

Whitebook, M., Sakai, L., Gerber, E., & Howes, C. (2001). *Then and Now: Changes in Child Care Staffing, 1994-2000*. Washington, D.C.: Center for the Child Care Workforce. Retrieved from <http://www.ccw.org/tpp/pubs/Then&Nowfull.pdf>.

Whitebook, M., Kipnis, F., Sakai, L., Voisin, I. & Young, M.P. (2004). *The California Child Care Workforce Study: 2001 Preliminary Results and Future Plans*.

Wolery, M. & Wilbers, J. (Eds.) (1994) *Including Children with Special Needs in Early Childhood Programs*. Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Zill, N., Renick, G., Kim, K. McKey, R.H., Clark, C., Pai-Samant, S., Connell, D., Vaden-Kiernan, M., O'Brien, R., & D'Elia, M.A. (2001) *Head Start FACES: Longitudinal Findings on Program Performance, Third Progress Report*. Washington, D.C.: Administration on Children, Youth and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.